DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 855 CE 046 541

TITLE	Oversight Hearing on Illiteracy. Joint Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, United States Senate, Ninety-Ninth Congress, Second Session (Washington, DC, June 12, 1986).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.; Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources.
PUB DATE	87
NOTE	67p.; Serial No. 99-140.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; *Adult Programs; *Correctional Education; *Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; Educational Television; Hearings; *Literacy Education; Prisoners; Program Development; Publicity; Public Television
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 99th

ABSTRACT

This document contains transcripts of testimony and written materials presented by four persons at a Congressional hearing on illiteracy. Testimony was given by Gerald L. Baliles, Governor of Virginia; James E. Duffy, vice president, Capital Cities/ABC; Karl O. Haigler, director of the Adult Literacy Initiative, U.S. Department of Education; and Patricia Keeton, coordinator, Basic Skills and Foreign-Born Programs, Howard Community College, Maryland. In his testimony and written report, Governor Baliles commented that many people who are illiterate turn to a life of crime. He reported that since many of the prisoners in the Virginia system are illiterate, the state has begun a program of "no read, no release" to teach prisoners to read before they are sent back into society. In his testimony, Duffy reported on the experience of ABC and the Public Broadcasting Service in Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS), which spotlights the problem of illiteracy; broadcasters work through their stations to reach adult illiterates and help them find educational programs to meet their needs. Haigler defended the budget needs of U.S. literacy efforts and said that financial support is crucial to help adults to read. Finally, Keeton testified that more must be done to fight illiteracy and that it is unproductive to publicize the problem while cutting funds for adult education. A discussion among committee members and participants is also included in the hearing proceedings. (KC)

ED279855

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON ILLITERACY

JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, ON JUNE 12, 1986

Serial No. 99-140

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
83-752 O WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

CE 045 341

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
RICK BOUCHER, Virginia
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
TERRY L. BRUCE, Illinois
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RICK BOUCHER, Virginia
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
JOHN R. McKERNAN, JR., Maine
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
(Ex Officio)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah, *Chairman*

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
PAULA HAWKINS, Florida
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, Iowa

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts

RONALD F. DOCKSAI, *Staff Director*
KATHRYN O'L. HIGGINS, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont, *Chairman*

ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii
PAUL SIMON, Illinois

POLLY GAULT, *Professional Staff Member*
DAVID V. EVANS, *Minority Professional Staff*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, DC, on June 12, 1986	1
Statement of:	
Baliles, Hon. Gerald L., Governor, Commonwealth of Virginia	3
Duffy, James E., vice president, Capital Cities/ABC and president of communications of the Network and Broadcast Division of ABC, New York	16
Haigler, Karl O., director, Adult Literacy Initiative, U.S. Department of Education	29
Keeton, Patricia, coordinator, Basic Skills and Foreign-Born Programs, Howard Community College, Maryland	41
Prepared statements, letters, and supplemental materials, and so forth:	
Baliles, Hon. Gerald L., Governor, State of Virginia, prepared statement of	9
Duffy, James E., vice president, Capital Cities/ABC and president of communications of the Network and Broadcast Division of ABC, prepared statement of	19
Haigler, Karl O., director, Adult Literacy Initiative, U.S. Department of Education, prepared statement of	33
Keeton, Patricia M., coordinator, Basic Skills and Foreign-Born Programs, Howard County Community College, Howard County, MD, prepared statement of	43
"13% of Adults in U.S., Are Illiterate in English, a New Federal Study Finds", article from New York Times, dated April 12, 1986	59

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON ILLITERACY

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1986

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION; SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS, AND HUMANITIES

Washington, DC.

The joint committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:16 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Senator Robert T. Stafford (chairman of the joint committee) presiding.

Members present from the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education: Representatives Hawkins, Martinez, Goodling, and Gunderson.

Members present from the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities: Senator Stafford.

Staff present from the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education: John F. Jennings, staff counsel; Nancy Kober, legislative analyst; and Beverly Griffin, staff assistant.

Present from the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities: Polly Gault, staff director, and Elizabeth Hackett, staff assistant.

Chairman STAFFORD. This joint meeting of the House and Senate committees, the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education, and the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities will please come to order.

Today these committees are going to hold the fourth in a series of hearings, and I want to say it's been a pleasure to work with Chairman Hawkins over the past year on the illiteracy problem; and I commend him on his leadership and his commitment in this area.

The subcommittee has been especially pleased with the variety of distinguished witnesses that have testified at the previous hearings. They have given us a keen understanding of the scope of the problem we face in this country, an understanding which is essential in moving forward to combat the problem of illiteracy.

It's very important that we continue to encourage increasing variety, accessibility, and public awareness of literacy problems, and that we remain open to new options and initiatives in hope that they will provide new sources of successful remediation.

We are pleased to have with us today four experts who are witnesses representing different programs or methods of illiteracy remediation or prevention. This should be an encouraging hearing,

although we cannot lay aside the responsibility we have to continue to work with this problem.

We are fortunate to have with us today as our first witness Gov. Gerald Baliles of Virginia. Governor Baliles will speak to us on his announced "No read, no release" parole policy for Virginia inmates. Eighty-five percent of juveniles who come before the courts are functionally illiterate, and 5 out of every 10 prison inmates cannot read. We are anxious to hear about the Governor's proposed policy.

Our next witness will be Mr. James Duffy, president of the office of communications for Capitol Cities, ABC, in New York. Mr. Duffy will discuss the ABC and PBS initiative called PLUS, Project Literacy U.S., to combat illiteracy. It will be interesting to hear about such an innovative and serious initiative coming from the ABC and PBS networks.

Last December our subcommittees working with the National Advisory Council on Adult Education requested that each Cabinet and Agency official provide a description of any activities supported by his or her agency to improve literacy or provide basic skills instruction. This information was requested to complement the information already received in the first three hearings and to improve coordination of adult literacy activities on the Federal level.

The Director of the Adult Illiteracy Initiative at the Department of Education is also with us today to share with us the results of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education's literacy management report. This report is a study on the 79 literacy related programs administered by 14 of our Federal agencies. Mr. Haigler will also report on the Department of Education's English language proficiency study.

The last witness today is representing the Joint Literacy Legislation Action Group. Patricia Keeton is a coordinator of basic skills and foreign-born programs in Maryland, and will speak to us about the action group's proposal for the improvement of illiteracy programs on the Federal level.

The subcommittee looks forward to hearing all of your testimonies this morning.

I want to pay a special tribute to my colleague, Congressman Gus Hawkins, the chairman of the House Committee on Education, for his double graciousness in not only inviting the Senate to appear here with him but even allowing a former House Member who has been in the Senate for some years now to come over here and cochair the meeting with him.

So with that, and asking unanimous consent that a statement by my colleague in the Senate, Senator Claiborne Pell, may appear in the record following Chairman Hawkins' own statement, the Chair would recognize Congressman—Chairman Hawkins.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you, Senator. Having been responsible for this delay, I will forego the reading of my statement and ask that it be included in the record as if it had been read. I would simply like to say that this is the third meeting of the joint committee—the two committees in a joint hearing, and I would like to particularly commend you, your willingness to schedule these hearings and to participate in them during these very busy days.

I would like to submit for the record a reference to the extent of illiteracy that has been recently circulated in the New York Times concerning the extent of illiteracy. Since this is the first time the Federal Government has actually acknowledged that the illiteracy rate is at least 13 percent, I think the statement is rather significant, and I would like for that article to be included in the record.

Chairman STAFFORD. Without objection, both your statement, Chairman Hawkins, and the material will be made a part of the record at this point.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you.

Chairman STAFFORD. Now without further ado, Governor Baliles, we would be delighted to hear from you. We very much appreciate your coming here this morning.

TESTIMONY OF HON. GERALD L. BALILES, GOVERNOR, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Governor BALILES. Thank you very much.

Chairman Stafford and Chairman Hawkins, it's an honor to join this group's continuing inquiry into one of the country's serious problems, that of illiteracy.

As your previous joint hearings have demonstrated so vividly, a distressing—and, I'm sorry to say, growing—number of Americans cannot read and write well enough to participate in the most basic economic and social activities. These Americans can't fill out job applications, because they can't read them. They can't communicate in writing, and the simplest tasks, reading a newspaper or following instructions on a can of food, are barriers to their personal progress in everyday life.

As a result, a number of them have turned to a profession that does not require an application form: crime.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about illiteracy in any form among any element of our population, but I will limit my remarks today to one important group within illiterate America, the men and women who populate our prisons and jails.

It is said that prison illiteracy rates are high in this country. I cannot speak for other States, but I can say this: It is sad truth that in Virginia two-thirds of our prisoners don't have a high school education, and more than a third are functionally illiterate.

I firmly believe that this is no coincidence. Quite the contrary. I would submit to you that crime and illiteracy go hand in hand. One, quite simply, feeds on the other.

Men and women who become prisoners of the State have often first become captives of their own illiteracy. And when the problem is ignored or left untouched, the likely result is clear. Prisoners will ultimately return to what they know best, crime.

Through criminal behavior, they'll return to jail and start the whole vicious cycle over again. The price of this revolving door of crime is paid not only in soaring corrections costs. It's also paid in human suffering and wasted lives.

Sociologists and criminologists have elaborate explanations for recidivism. Some focus, for instance, on the alleged development of a criminal subclass within the larger society. But I believe that

part of the explanation is a simple recognition of the power and centrality in modern life of the written word.

We're trying to tap that power in Virginia. Earlier this year, I asked our parole board and corrections officials to develop a program by which every illiterate inmate in Virginia would be given a clear incentive to learn to read while serving his time.

In designing an incentive, I asked them to emphasize the one thing that matters most to prisoners, getting out. The result is our new Literacy Incentive Program, the shorthand term for which is "no read, no release."

The concept is simple. For each and every functionally illiterate prisoner, one of the important factors in determining whether he is paroled will be satisfactory progress in reading programs.

It is our policy that no prisoner with an identified deficiency, defined as an inability to read at a sixth grade level, will be released on parole until a thorough assessment of his educational progress and proficiency has been made.

There will be only one substantial exemption. Those who have a bona fide mental or learning disability will not be required to participate in the program.

We have already begun to implement the first phase of "no read, no release." We have developed preliminary procedures for identifying illiterate prisoners, tested them at one institution, and revised our approach in light of our experience.

We are now applying those procedures throughout our correctional system. Within the next 2 weeks, we will have identified our entire target population. We'll then give each of them a reading comprehension test developed by the college board.

Initial experience suggests that as many as 40 percent of our inmates will be unable to read at the sixth grade level. Those inmates will be given the opportunity to attend reading classes geared to their skill levels.

Those who make a good faith effort, who make progress appropriate to persons of similar capacity, will have that fact noted in their institutional records. And those who don't try, or who drop out, will have that fact noted as well.

The parole board will give an inmate's performance in this program a prominent place when it considers whether to parole him. Reading skill will thus be an important criterion in the parole decision.

It will not be the only criterion. The educational capacity of the offender and the progress he has made during his term will also be taken into account. Achievement is important, but so is attitude.

Although we might wish, as Chief Justice Burger put it in a speech given more than 15 years ago, that every criminal sentence would end only when the offender could read and write, we know that such an ironclad requirement isn't possible.

What is possible is to provide a meaningful incentive, and to provide the programs and the encouragement to make it work. The outpouring of support we have received since announcing "no read, no release" reinforces my belief in this common sense initiative.

We have received supportive letters from all parts of the country and all walks of life, from a White House staffer to Rudolf Flesch,

author of the famous 1955 study entitled "Why Johnny Can't Read," to a Virginia inmate eager to join the program.

Of course, as with any new initiative, there has been skepticism and criticism. Some have wondered whether the emphasis on literacy will have any effect, whether it isn't just a futile gesture.

I say to them that we must try. Criminal recidivism is too high a price for a civilized society to pay for its educational failures. And in Virginia we have backed our beliefs with money, by adding nearly a million dollars to our correctional education budget to fund literacy programs.

Other critics have seen "no read, no release" as unfair; or worse, a violation of constitutional due process.

I say those criticisms are unfounded. Parole is a privilege, not a right. "No read, no release" isn't a barrier. It's a door to law abiding citizenship and gainful employment, and we believe that the time has come to open that door a little wider for one group of illiterate Americans.

At a minimum, our efforts will help reduce adult illiteracy. And with a commitment to this program, we may even succeed in reducing the vicious cycle that turns crime into a calling. In Virginia, we think that's worth our attention.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Governor. I suppose it's so early in the program that this may not be a good question, but I would wonder if you could tell us how the inmates in your institutions have reacted to the program, "no read, no release."

Governor BALILES. It's my understanding that there are some mixed reviews. Some are interested; some are not. I might also tell you that, based on a couple of inquiries I've made, at some institutions where, obviously, inmates can read, the checkout rate at the library soared 50 percent after the 1 week of this announcement.

I'm not sure whom they are trying to convince, or whether they think it will make a difference; but someone does.

Chairman STAFFORD. I know—I remember at the time you announced it that Chuck Colson, the gentleman I used to know here in Washington, expressed some opposition on the ground that it was a constitutional violation of prisoners' rights.

I wonder, has there been any court test of his statement to that effect?

Governor BALILES. I'm not aware, Senator, of any court challenge to it. That's not to say that it won't occur, but I feel reasonably confident about our ability to withstand a legal challenge.

Chairman STAFFORD. In connection with the "no read, no release," may I assume that that applies to the inmate who wishes to get out on parole, and not to an inmate who's completed his full term, because then I would think you might have some question of constitutionality?

Governor BALILES. Well, it's been clearly stated that we cannot hold a prisoner beyond the time of the sentence imposed by the courts. We understand that. We're simply saying that the one motivating factor in a prisoner is the parole date.

That's why prison systems around the country, Federal and State, have instituted good behavior programs. For so many days of

good behavior, there is a subtraction of time from the sentence. That would then make them eligible for parole.

Chairman STAFFORD. Certainly.

Governor BALILES. It's the carrot and stick approach that's been applied. It seems to me that it has not been applied in this area of endeavor, and it ought to be.

Chairman STAFFORD. Well, I think that it's a very good plan. After your experience has run on a bit, I'd like to hear more about its success, because I think I might like to recommend it to my own State as a consideration up there.

Governor BALILES. We'll keep you apprised.

Chairman STAFFORD. I'll keep in touch with you then, Governor. Thank you.

Chairman Hawkins.

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, Governor, I certainly wish to commend you on this innovative idea. My question may seem to be somewhat critical of it, but it certainly is not intended to be so.

The only thing that strikes me about the idea that may be negative would be the unfairness of it. Obviously, you have some inmates who read very well. Perhaps they're brilliant students. Then you have some who don't. I'm thinking of the original responsibility of society in a country in which we have universal free compulsory education to educate every person. And yet the failure to do so is not always the fault of the individual who may end up being incarcerated.

Yet that individual being denied Head Start, being denied early childhood programs, being denied compensatory education, the opportunity to advance, ends up in prison. So you have two classes.

Are we in effect then making a condition for release based on the individual rather than on the denial to that individual of these opportunities at an earlier age. If we had the same captive group throughout education, it would seem to me that there would be no question but that the system as you have proposed it would operate fairly. But if we had, let's say, at the very beginning "no read, no promotion to next class" for every person so that we would indeed institute the idea at an earlier age, then it would seem to me that would increase the fairness of the system.

What I suppose I'm asking is whether or not you are at the same time in the State instituting these reforms so that you have fewer inmates or, let's say humorously, a better class of inmates, those who can read from the very beginning—would it not be even much more important to institute some of these reforms prior to the time that individual commits a crime and goes to prison?

Governor BALILES. Congressman, I think in Virginia, as in many other States, in recent years there's been a handsome investment made in education at all levels, elementary and secondary education as well as the higher institutional level. Virginia has committed a tremendous amount of resources to educational reform and improvement of education in general.

Now that educational commitment will continue, as I hope it will all over the country. I happen to believe that education is really the foundation for the future of this country, and that commitment must be widespread. It must be deep, and we're doing that in the Commonwealth.

What we're attempting to do with this one program is to deal with an after-the-fact problem. There is no question about the statistical correlation between illiteracy and crime. Prison populations have an illiteracy rate that, depending on your State, ranges from 2, 3, 4, even 10 times higher than that in the population at large.

The Justice Department commissioned a study entitled "National Study on Learning Deficiencies in Adult Inmates." What that study found was that the average inmate left school after the 10th grade, but performed at least 3 years below that level or 7th grade level. We consider sixth grade functionally illiterate.

That study also concluded that 42 percent of those prisoners studied were functioning at or below the fifth grade level on a nationally tested measure.

So we're finding also that many of the people once released who are deemed to be functionally illiterate have never held a full-time job, or in many cases held any employment beyond a few hours a week. So that national study concluded that there is a relationship that exists between functional illiteracy and the lack of employment and crime.

What we are attempting to address is the functional illiteracy problem within the prisons while they're there. The statistics show that many of them come back, and they come back because they haven't been able to find gainful employment and to keep it.

We live in a fast-moving, complex society where reading comprehension is critical for many jobs, even basic jobs. If that prisoner whiles away the time in a prison without any effort being made to improve educational and reading skills, then we can pretty well predict what's going to happen. They're going to come back, and we're spending $20,000 a year on a prisoner.

I'd much rather find a way to spend a few dollars on an educational program, motivate them to participate in the hope that they will avoid coming back, in order that we can find a way to break that vicious cycle.

I don't think there's any unfairness element there. We've screened out those who are incapable of learning, for mental or other learning disability reasons. We're simply saying, if you want to have the parole board look at you favorably in terms of your behavior in prison, we're going to add reading ability and the ability to learn to read and your performance as one of those factors.

I think that it's a program worthy of further consideration. We intend to implement it.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you, Chairman Hawkins. Mr. Martinez, would you have any questions or any statement at this point?

Mr. MARTINEZ. No, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman STAFFORD. All right. Thank you. Governor, we thank you very much for joining us this morning.

Governor BALILES. Thank you, Senator.

Chairman STAFFORD. As I said, we'll stay in touch.

Governor BALILES. Thank you very much.

Chairman STAFFORD. Next, the joint hearing will hear a panel consisting of Mr. James Duffy who is vice president, Capital Cities/ABC, and president of communications of the Network and Broadcast Division of ABC, accompanied by Dr. John E. Harr, vice presi-

dent, Office of Communication, same organization; Mr. Karl O. Haigler, director, Adult Literacy Initiative, U.S. Department of Education; and Patricia Keeton, coordinator of basic skills and foreign-born programs, Howard Community College, MD, representing the Joint Literacy Legislation Action Group.

It would be the Chair's intention, unless you have agreed among yourselves on a protocol for this hearing, that we go in the order in which we have announced your name, which means, Mr. Duffy, that you would go first.

I want to inject a personal note first. I understand the celebrated Burke family from—we claim in Vermont, and from my hometown, not only is involved heavily in ABC but one of the brothers is the chairman of Johnson & Johnson. So if you see your Mr. Burke, you might tell him that a fellow Rutlander sends best regards.

[Prepared statement of Governor Gerald L. Baliles follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. GERALD L. BALILES, GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is an honor to join this group's continuing inquiry into one of this country's serious problems -- illiteracy.

As your previous joint hearings have demonstrated so vividly, a distressing -- and, I am sorry to say, growing -- number of Americans cannot read and write well enough to participate in the most basic economic and social activities.

These Americans can't fill out job applications -- because they can't read them. They can't communicate in writing, and the simplest tasks --- reading a newspaper, or following instructions on a can of food --- are barriers to their personal progress in everyday life.

And, as a result, a number of them have turned to a profession that does not require an application form: crime.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about illiteracy in any form -- among any element of our population. But I will limit my remarks today to one important group within illiterate America: the men and women who populate our prisons and jails.

It is said that prison illiteracy rates are high in this country. I cannot speak for other states -- but I can say this:

It is the sad truth that in Virginia two-thirds of our prisoners don't have a high school education -- and more than a third are functionally illiterate.

And I firmly believe that this is no coincidence.

Quite the contrary: I would submit to you that crime and illiteracy go hand-in-hand. One, quite simply, feeds on the other.

Men and women who become prisoners of the state have often first become captives of their own illiteracy.

And when the problem is ignored or left untouched, the likely result is clear. Prisoners will ultimately return to what they know best: crime.

Through criminal behavior, they'll return to jail -- and start the whole vicious cycle over again.

The price of this revolving door of crime is paid not only in soaring corrections costs.

It's also paid in human suffering and wasted lives.

Sociologists and criminologists have created elaborate explanations for recidivism. Some focus, for instance, on the alleged development of a "criminal subclass" within the larger society.

But I believe that part of the explanation is a simple recognition of the power, and centrality in modern life, of the written word.

We're trying to tap that power in Virginia.

Earlier this year, I asked our Parole Board and corrections officials to develop a program by which every illiterate inmate in Virginia would be given a clear incentive to learn to read while serving his time.

In designing an incentive, I asked them to emphasize the one thing that matters most to a prisoner -- getting out.

The result is our new "Literacy Incentive Program" -- the shorthand term for it is "no read, no release."

The concept is simple: for each and every functionally illiterate prisoner, one of the important factors in determining whether he is paroled will be satisfactory progress in reading programs.

It is our policy that no prisoner with an identified deficiency -- defined as inability to read at a sixth-grade level -- will be released on parole until a thorough assessment of his educational progress and proficiency has been made.

There will be only one substantial exemption: those who have a bona fide mental or learning disability will not be required to participate in the program.

We have already begun to implement the first phase of "no read, no release."

We have developed preliminary procedures for identifying illiterate prisoners, tested them at one institution, and revised our approach in light of our experience.

We are now applying those procedures throughout our correctional system. Within the next two weeks, we will have identified our entire target population.

We'll then give each of them a reading comprehension test developed by the College Board.

Initial experience suggests that as many as 40% of our inmates will be unable to read at a sixth-grade level.

Those inmates will be given the opportunity to attend reading classes geared to their skill levels.

Those who make a good faith effort -- who make progress appropriate to persons of similar capacity -- will have that fact noted in their institutional records.

And those who don't try -- or who drop out -- will have that fact noted, as well.

The Parole Board will give an inmate's performance in this program a prominent place when it considers whether to parole him.

Reading skill will thus be an important criterion in the parole decision.

It will not be the only criterion.

The educational capacity of the offender and the progress he's made during his term will also be taken into account.

Achievement is important. But so is attitude.

Although we might wish -- as Chief Justice Burger put it in a speech given more than 15 years ago -- that every criminal sentence would end only when the offender could read and write, we know that such an ironclad requirement isn't possible.

What is possible is to create a meaningful incentive -- and to provide the programs and the encouragement to make it work.

The outpouring of support we have received since announcing "no read, no release" reinforces my belief in this common-sense initiative.

We've received supportive letters from all parts of the country and all walks of life -- from a White House staffer ... to Rudolf Flesch, author of the famous 1955 study entitled "Why Johnny Can't Read" ... to a Virginia inmate eager to join the program.

Of course, as with any new initiative, there has been skepticism ... and criticism.

Some have wondered whether the emphasis on literacy will have any effect -- whether it isn't just a futile gesture.

I say to them that we must try. Criminal recidivism is too high a price for a civilized society to pay for its educational failures.

And in Virginia we've backed our beliefs with money, by adding nearly a million dollars to our correctional education budget to fund literacy programs.

Other critics have seen "no read, no release" as unfair -- or worse, a violation of constitutional due process.

I say those criticisms are unfounded.

Parole is a privilege -- not a right.

"No read, no release" isn't a barrier -- it's a door to law-abiding citizenship and gainful employment.

And we believe that the time has come to open that door a little wider for one group of illiterate Americans.

At a minimum, our efforts will help to reduce adult illiteracy.

And with a commitment to this program, we may even succeed in reducing the vicious cycle that turns crime into a calling.

In Virginia, we think that's worth our attention.

Thank you very much.

#

TESTIMONY OF JAMES E. DUFFY, VICE PRESIDENT, CAPITAL CITIES/ABC, AND PRESIDENT OF COMMUNICATIONS OF THE NETWORK AND BROADCAST DIVISION OF ABC, NEW YORK

Mr. DUFFY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll certainly do that.

Mr. Chairman, my name is James E. Duffy, and I am vice president of Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., and president of communications of the Network and Broadcast Division of ABC. With me indeed is my colleague, Dr. John E. Harr, who is vice president, the Office of Communication, Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., and project director for ABC Project Literacy, U.S. Dr. Harr is available with me to respond to any questions that members of the committee may have.

I'd like to have permission, if I could, sir, to insert copies of the text of my remarks into the record.

Chairman STAFFORD. Without objection, that will be so ordered.

Mr. DUFFY. Thank you.

We welcome with gratitude the opportunity to briefly describe to you the joint public service campaign that Capital Cities/ABC and the Public Broadcasting Service have embarked upon, known as Project Literacy U.S., as well as by the acronym PLUS, and also to share with you some of the experience and perspective we have gained in the course of preparing and launching PLUS.

I know that members of these subcommittees and staffs are very knowledgeable about the nearly unbelievable dimensions of the problem of adult illiteracy in the United States. As a matter of fact, one of the best sources of information for us as we worked on the development of PLUS was the records of your previous joint hearings. The dimensions of the problem, as you are aware, are staggering.

Taking that into account, this is where television and its ability to reach out with its impact to perhaps help in halting this problem. I would like to focus my remarks on the role that television and radio will play in Project Literacy U.S.

PLUS was announced at a press conference here in Washington at the Library of Congress last December 10. It is designed to operate in two phases. The first, which is now well underway, we refer to as outreach development. The second, involving an unprecedented amount of on-air radio and television programming about adult illiteracy beginning in September, is what we call the awareness raising phase.

This design results from the desire of ABC and PBS not to engage simply in a media blitz, but to do whatever we can to help communities across the country prepare for the increased demand for literacy services that is certain to result from the media spotlight that will be thrown on this problem, not only by ABC and by PBS in PLUS, but also by other broadcasters around the country and by the Nation's magazines and newspapers.

In outreach—in the outreach phase we have taken pains to reach those who can help fight illiteracy, to let them know what is going to happen in September so that they can be prepared. We have done this with leadership groups in key sectors of American life, with Federal agencies including the Department of Education and the Department of Labor, with Governors, mayors, and the repre-

sentatives of more than 100 national organizations that have endorsed Project Literacy U.S.

At the same time, all 212 ABC affiliated television stations and 313 PBS member stations have appointed literacy coordinators on their staffs to work with all available resources in their respective communities to generate local preparedness.

As a result of this effort, to date more than 200 local task forces have come into existence in cities across the country. Chapters and members of the national organizations are tying into those task forces on the local level as well.

There will be a concentration of television and radio programming on illiteracy in September, but the awareness effort will continue beyond that, throughout the entire broadcast season until June of 1987. The kick-off event will be an ABC news documentary on the full ABC television network on Wednesday, September 3, at 10 p.m. eastern time.

Then on Sunday, September 7, the "This Week With David Brinkley" program will focus on adult illiteracy, as will a multipart "Special Assignment" series on ABC World News Tonight the following week. "Nightline" with Ted Koppel and our newsmagazine program "20/20" will also participate during the month of September, and on the 17th of September at 8 p.m. PBS will broadcast its companion documentary, focusing on community action to deal with illiteracy.

Then in the following months "Good Morning America" will frequently have interviews and features on the subject. There will be an "ABC Notebook" program. We think that dramatic programming can play a very important role, and so there will be an "After School Special" on illiteracy, a story line in a daytime serial, and episodes in several prime-time series, and perhaps a special drama in prime-time toward the end of the season. There will also be special messages on ABC sports programming, and PBS will carry a GED series and a special series on the English language.

Tying it all together throughout the season will be special reports by ABC News and public service announcements on the network featuring the 800 number national literacy hotline.

There will be two other programming contributions that will be very important, in addition to the network programming that I've already described. One will be the attention to the subject by the six networks of the ABC radio networks with their 1,800 local affiliates, featuring public service announcements, minidocumentaries, and public affairs programming.

The second and perhaps the most important of all will be locally produced programming by all of the ABC and PBS stations across the country, tailored to their particular needs and problems of their communities, supplementing and complementing the national programming that will appear on the two networks.

From this overview, one can see that PLUS is an unprecedented public service campaign on several counts: First, the collaboration between two broadcasting systems which has never occurred before on such a sustained basis; and second, the 18-month time commitment that ABC and PBS have made and the scale and scope of the plan; and then third, the emphasis on the outreach phase preceding the actual programming.

Altogether, PLUS represents a new level of public service within the broadcasting industry. In undertaking the PLUS campaign we at ABC and PBS are very much aware of the sensitivity of this problem for those afflicted and are taking great care to see that that sensitivity is reflected in everything we do, both in outreach and awareness.

We are also very much aware of our limitations. We are not experts in education. We are not literacy service providers. Many dedicated individuals have been working on the problem of adult illiteracy for a long time, both in the public education field and the volunteer organizations. We are latecomers. Our role is to communicate, perhaps to convene and facilitate and then encourage participation.

However, in developing PLUS over the past year we have become convinced that a national movement is growing within this Nation to finally face up to the problem of adult illiteracy.

Illiteracy, quite properly, has been called America's hidden problem, and we feel that it is time that America's hidden problem goes public in the fullest sense of that term. It is time that it becomes the business of everyone who cares about the future of this great country, and it is this conviction that underlies Project Literacy U.S.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Mr. Duffy.

[Prepared statement of James E. Duffy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES E. DUFFY, VICE PRESIDENT, CAPITAL CITIES/ABC AND PRESIDENT OF COMMUNICATIONS OF THE NETWORK AND BROADCAST DIVISION OF ABC

My name is James E. Duffy, and I am Vice President of Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., and President of Communications of the Network and Broadcast Division of ABC. With me is my colleague, Dr. John E. Harr, Vice President, Office of Communication, Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., and Project Director for ABC of Project Literacy U.S. Dr. Harr is available with me to respond to any questions that members of the committee may have.

We welcome with gratitude the opportunity to briefly describe to you the joint public service campaign that Capital Cities/ABC and the Public Broadcasting Service have embarked upon, known as "Project Literacy U. S." as well as by the acronym "PLUS," and also to share with you some of the experience and perspective we have gained in the course of preparing and launching PLUS.

I know that the members of these subcommittees and staffs are very knowledgeable about the nearly unbelievable dimensions of the problem of adult illiteracy in the United States. In fact, one of the best sources of information for us as we worked

on the development of PLUS was the record of your previous joint hearings. As far as the problem itself is concerned, however, I do want to say that in PLUS we are using the figure of 23 million adult illiterates, which we arrived at after a great deal of conversation with the U. S. Department of Education and other sources. We believe it is a defensible and conservative figure, although as we all know one of our current weaknesses is a lack of precision in data and definitions, a weakness that I believe will be overcome as more and more attention is directed to the serious problem of adult illiteracy.

We know also that another 30 to 35 million adults are semi-literate, with basic skills limited to what we would commonly regard as the fifth to eighth grade levels. We know, too, that illiteracy is widespread, a problem in every community, not limited by region, race, ethnicity, or economic status. Yet it is well documented that illiteracy correlates with other serious problems such as unemployment, crime, welfare, and poverty. One of our motivations in undertaking PLUS is the belief that to the extent we can make progress in overcoming adult illiteracy we will also make progress in other areas.

I would like to focus my remarks on the role that television and radio will play in Project Literacy U.S. PLUS was announced at a press conference here in Washington at the Library of Congress last December 10th. It is designed to operate in two

phases. The first, now well under way, we refer to as "outreach development." The second, involving an unprecedented amount of on-air programming about adult illiteracy beginning in September, is the "awareness-raising" phase. This design results from the desire of ABC and PBS not to engage simply in a "media blitz," but to do whatever we can to help communities across the country prepare for the increased demand for literacy services that is certain to result from the media spotlight that will be thrown on this problem -- not only by ABC and PBS in PLUS, but also by other broadcasters and by the nation's magazines and newspapers.

In outreach we have taken pains to reach those who can help fight illiteracy, to let them know what is going to happen in September so they can prepare. We have done this with leadership groups in key sectors of American life, with Federal agencies, Governors, Mayors, and the representatives of more than 100 national organizations that have endorsed PLUS.

At the same time, all 212 ABC affiliated television stations and 313 PBS member stations have appointed "literacy coordinators" on their staffs to work with all available resources in their respective communities to generate local preparedness. As a result of this effort, to date more than [illegible] local task forces have come into existence in cities across the

country. Chapters and members of the national organizations are tying in to those task forces on the local level.

There will be a concentration of programming on illiteracy in September, but the awareness effort will continue beyond that, throughout the entire broadcast season until June 1987. The kick-off event will be an ABC News documentary on the full ABC Television Network on Wednesday, September 3rd, at 10 PM Eastern time. On Sunday September 7th the "This Week with David Brinkley" program will focus on adult illiteracy, as will a multi-part "Special Assignment" series on ABC World News Tonight the following week. "Nightline" with Ted Koppel and our newsmagazine program "20/20" will also participate during September, and on the 17th at 8 PM PBS will broadcast its companion documentary, focusing on community action to deal with illiteracy.

In the following months "Good Morning America" will frequently have interviews and features on the subject. There will be an "ABC Notebook" program. We think that dramatic programming can play an important role, and so there will be an "ABC After School Special" on illiteracy, a story line in a daytime serial, episodes in several prime-time series, and perhaps a special drama in prime-time. There will also be special messages on ABC Sports programming. PBS will carry a GED series and a special series on the English language. Tying

it all together throughout the season will be special reports by ABC News and public service announcements on the network featuring the 800 number national literacy hotline.

There will be two other programming contributions that will be very important in addition to the network programming I've already described. One will be attention to the subject by the six networks of ABC radio with their 1,800 local affiliates, featuring public service announcements, mini-documentaries, and public affairs programming. The second, perhaps the most important of all, will be locally-produced programming by all the ABC and PBS stations, tailored to the particular needs and problems of their communities, supplementing and complementing the national programming that will appear on the two networks.

From this overview, one can see that PLUS is an unprecedented public service campaign on several counts: first, the collaboration between two broadcasting systems, which has never occurred before on such a sustained basis; second, the 18-month time commitment that ABC and PBS have made and the scale and scope of the plan; and third, the emphasis on outreach preceding the programming.

We tend to think of illiteracy as a national problem, which it certainly is, but it can only be dealt with effectively at the local level, where people live and work. This is why

outreach is so important, because the focus must be on community action . . . and the structure of television networks as associations of local stations qualifies them uniquely to be of service on the local level, reinforced by the network's national presence. In this regard, I think it is significant that the initiative for ABC's involvement in this campaign came from the General Managers of several of our affiliated stations and they have pledged their full cooperation.

Altogether, PLUS represents a new level of public service within the broadcasting industry. Television stations go way beyond the minimal public service requirements of the FCC. They are leading community institutions in their own right, very much concerned with continually serving their communities in local news coverage and public service activities. Networks are very sensitive to their public service role, for example, broadcasting special dramatic programs dealing with difficult social issues such as drug abuse, alcoholism, teen-age suicide, domestic violence. The networks coordinate closely with their affiliated stations through their community relations staffs, regularly preparing special materials for schools and social service agencies to enhance the educational and social impact of such programs.

PLUS is a new stage entirely in the maturing of the television system -- the first instance of a television network, two television networks in fact, and all their affiliated

stations coordinating on the same public service theme at the same time, and over an extended period of time.

In undertaking the PLUS campaign, we at ABC and PBS are very much aware of the sensitivity of this problem for those afflicted and are taking great care to see that that sensitivity is reflected in everything we do, both in outreach and awareness. We are also aware of our limitations. We are not experts in education. We are not literacy service-providers. Many dedicated individuals have been working on the problem of adult illiteracy for a long time, both in the public education field and the volunteer organizations. We are latecomers; our role is to communicate, perhaps to convene and facilitate and encourage participation.

However, in developing PLUS over the past year we have become convinced that a national movement is growing within this nation to finally face up to the problem of adult illiteracy. That movement was stirring before ABC and PBS became involved in PLUS -- in the President's call for a literacy initiative of three years ago, the Federal Literacy Initiative, the work of your two committees and growing awareness of the problem generally within the Congress and Federal agencies, growing concern on the part of Governors and Mayors across the country, the creation of the National Literacy Coalition and the national

literacy hotline, the Ad Council campaign, the founding of the Business Council for Effective Literacy, growing involvement by the private sector, particularly in the print industry.

With all of this stirring, PLUS may very well play a key role in accelerating that national movement by helping to give it shape and visibility and creating a framework for participation on the local level.

One sign that a national movement is indeed underway is the extraordinarily positive response to PLUS by all those with whom we have been in contact -- all three levels of government, the business community, the non-profit organizations, the other media, the religious community, and, most important, the leaders of all the key national associations in public education.

Illiteracy quite properly has been called "America's hidden problem." It has been neglected for decades for two very good reasons. First, the trauma of illiteracy quite understandably leads those afflicted to hide their affliction as best they can. They thus are the very opposite of a vocal constituency. The second reason is that the total society could simply afford to live with the worst rate of illiteracy of any industrialized nation in the world, indeed be largely unaware of it, because no manifest breakdown occurred. This country is so big and wealthy

and productive that we could tolerate the fact of 23 million functionally illiterate adults and another 30 to 35 million semi-literates. Nothing forced us to act.

The reason a national movement is now developing is that that comfortable situation is changing drastically -- and thoughtful leaders in government, business, education, and the media are becoming more and more aware of that fact. Demographic trends, the rate of illiteracy, and technological change are combining to create a dangerous situation for the United States not too many years in the future. Already the decline of smokestack industries is displacing workers who lack the basic skills to retrain for new jobs. Manual jobs are disappearing, replaced by jobs that require language skills and comprehension. Not too many years from now we may have more jobs than people to fill them, more job skills requirements than skills available. We are going to need significant numbers of those 23 million functionally illiterate adults as productive members of our communities and work force in a post-industrial economy. Our future prosperity and strength as a nation will depend on it.

In short, we now have an economic imperative to combat illiteracy, added to the moral and human rights imperative.

It is time that America's hidden problem goes public in the fullest sense of that term. It is time that it becomes the business of everyone who cares about the future of this great country. It is this conviction that underlies Project Literacy U.S.

Chairman STAFFORD. Next the joint hearing will hear from Mr. Karl O. Haigler, and—the stage is yours.

TESTIMONY OF KARL O. HAIGLER, DIRECTOR, ADULT LITERACY INITIATIVE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. HAIGLER. Good morning, Chairman Stafford, Chairman Hawkins.

I appreciate this opportunity to share with you Secretary Bennett's position on the serious national problem of adult illiteracy. In announcing his priorities for the next fiscal year, the Secretary made clear his commitment to address the issue in one way by a requested $4.4 million restoring the Adult Education Program to its pre-Gramm-Rudman funding level.

In a time of fiscal stringency, this is in keeping with the Department's focus on helping the educationally disadvantaged, the handicapped and those with limited English proficiency. The Secretary has outlined five "guiding principles" which will direct our approach to this issue. Those principles include:

Prevention that focuses on the proper teaching of reading in our elementary schools;

Research that can guide policy and inform practice;

Shared responsibility of educational achievement between schools, parents and students;

Expansion of literacy services through increased participation of the private sector, volunteer groups, and community based organizations; and

Better coordination of programs within and between Federal agencies.

The Secretary's final guiding principle, better program coordination among adult literacy programs, has become a major focus for the office that I direct, the Adult Literacy Initiative. The initiative was established in September of 1983 by the President in order to underscore the seriousness of this issue for the nation.

One charge of the initiative is to help build and support a national network of public and private literacy programs. We think that the results of the survey on which we are reporting to you today have significant implications for expanding resources for literacy.

The survey was undertaken at the request of the initiative and in cooperation with the Federal Interagency Committee on Education, or FICE. FICE was established by section 214 of the Department of Education Organization Act, which states that FICE—

> Shall study issues and make recommendations for assuring effective interagency coordination of Federal programs, policies and administrative practices affecting education.

Conducted by the Washington Consulting Group, the Federal Literacy Management survey provides us with one tool for accomplishing, in the words of the FICE statute:

> The coordination of related programs to assure that the recipients of Federal assistance are efficiently and responsively served.

An interagency committee, composed of policy professionals and led by Paul Delker, the Director of Adult Education at the Department, constructed a broad operational definition of literacy programs in keeping with the definition of functional literacy. That is:

The attainment of knowledge and skills, including reading, writing, speaking, listening, computing and problem solving normally associated with the ability to function at least at an eighth grade level in adult situations.

Adult literacy activities are defined in this report as formal or informal efforts, including portions of broader programs, which aim at the development of functional literacy. These activities include: Programs for Basic Skills Training, Life Skills, programs for non-English speaking adults, and programs which address hindrances to literacy, such as learning disabilities and other handicaps.

Let me briefly review the key findings of the survey:

There are 79 programs administered by 14 Federal agencies which directly address literacy concerns, have a significant literacy related component, or permit State or local recipients to use funds for literacy activities.

For fiscal year 1985, $347.6 million were obligated for literacy activities. This estimate includes some funds appropriated for programs with broad purposes including, but not specifically limited to, literacy. On the other hand, the authors of the report were not able to obtain estimates of spending on literacy from major literacy related programs such as Job Corps or the Job Training Partnership Act, so no funds from these programs are included in the total that I just mentioned.

Another finding of the survey was: Federal literacy programs address the needs of many different populations and are directed toward a variety of goals. Special programs have been designed for the elderly, Native Americans, refugees, Federal prisoners, high school dropouts, the handicapped, the unemployed, and the limited English proficient adult. Many programs focus on assisting individuals to gain the skills necessary to obtain employment or to live independently.

There are significant unreported expenditures on literacy activities in many Federal agencies. In some cases, literacy activities are an integral part of the overall program, but no separate dollar breakdown for these activities is available. In formula grant programs, literacy is an authorized activity, but the State or local entity reports expenditures only by broad categories.

In addition to an executive summary, the report contains detailed program descriptions of the 79 programs that I mentioned. I would like to call your attention to a few items of interest in these descriptions.

First, the majority of programs surveyed did not provide information for measuring or evaluating program success.

Next, "Secondary programs," that is, programs in which literacy is an allowable activity and supports the primary objective of the legislation, are typically unable to report a specific percentage of dollars or dollar amounts that go to literacy. For the Job Training Partnership Act, for instance, we know for the $656 million which went to training services for the disadvantaged under title II-A, there was included some classroom training, and approximately one-third of the program participants were involved in this training. In addition, approximately 30,000 youth received either remedial or basic education services last year in Job Corps Centers.

Third, the variety of disadvantaged populations served and the social deficits that are identified underscore the fact that it's diffi-

cult to view illiteracy in a vacuum. Rather, the survey helps by portraying the need for literacy in the context of other needs which these programs address.

Let me now turn to the uses we see for this survey.

I can speak directly about the survey's contents as a coordination guide for Federal agencies, because it has already contributed to the work of two distinct interagency task force or working groups with which the Adult Literacy Initiative has been involved.

First, in association with the Labor Department's Education and Training Administration, five program offices within the Department are discussing a variety of joint projects. These offices include Bilingual Education, Vocational and Adult Education, Special Education, Elementary and Secondary Education, and finally, Postsecondary Education. These projects would focus on preemployment activities for the disadvantaged, handicapped and limited English proficient adults. The Initiative's role is to be a continuing sponsor and monitor of such collaborative efforts.

Second, our other major interagency activity involves our working with the Departments of Defense, Labor and Commerce to develop a plan for field testing the Army's newest basic skills program in civilian adult literacy job training vocational settings. We are involving interested private sector representatives as well as the States in establishing a more systematic way of disseminating Federally developed technology for literacy. The significant investment of tax dollars in Defense basic skills programs will continue to be exploited for their possible benefits to the field of adult education.

Much of the information in this report will be useful to literacy providers and adult educators, because it identifies Federal programs administered at the State and local level. The Secretary believes that the widest possible variety of organizations should be involved in meeting the needs of adult illiterates, as also the intent of the Adult Education Act. Therefore, in partnership with the Cambridge Book Co. and diverse literacy and adult education organizations, the Department intends to disseminate this survey as widely as possible.

As an example of technology transfer using the most modern means of telecommunications, we will make the report available to all users of LitLine, which the Adult Literacy Initiative jointly sponsors with the mayor's commission on literacy in Philadelphia. LitLine holds the promise of reaching an even broader audience if we can use it to provide useful information like the results of the FICE survey.

All of the Department's adult literacy efforts are intended to strengthen and develop the State and local networks which are rising to meet the challenge of illiteracy. The Federal role in this effort is crucial. On that, there is a clear consensus. The Secretary has indicated his commitment to departmental leadership on this issue, especially in those areas where it can make the most difference.

He will be a spokesman during the ABC/PBS PLUS project, and the Department will continue to provide support for PLUS's outreach activities. In the areas of research, the National Assessment of Educational Progress will be releasing this summer an in depth

assessment of functional literacy skills of young adults aged 21 to 25. It will be the most in depth literacy assessment of adults to date.

The Office of Educational Research and Improvement will be conducting competitions for the study of adult literacy in association with the new Reading Center competition, and will be sponsoring a literacy conference this summer. An additional $2 million which the Secretary has requested in next year's budget under the Adult Education Act can be used for field research to identify the most effect approaches for teaching adults.

The role of the States and localities is especially significant, given the discretion provided in the use of Federal funds through State and community grant programs. Program coordination, as envisioned by the FICE survey, is crucial at those levels of government which can fashion the most appropriate responses to the needs of its citizens.

We also know that only as education continues to improve in our elementary and secondary schools, with better reading instruction, higher graduation standards, and lower dropout rates, will we see a major reduction in functional illiteracy over time. But the example of parents or even grandparents who value learning can be inspirational to the young who have a much greater—who have much greater educational opportunities, and we know that these examples of adults, this support that adults can provide, is crucial to academic success.

I've been reminded of this in my travels around the country, and I'd like to relate one anecdote in that regard. On one of my trips I met a VISTA worker who is now helping support a local Laubach literacy program. Eleanor didn't learn to read until she was over 60 years old. She told me she was never embarrassed to admit this, because she really never had a chance to attend schools regularly. It seems she was the only girl in her family, and her parents wouldn't let her walk the five miles to school.

She reckoned that she spent less than 100 days total in school. Eleanor went back to school when her daughter came back home to teach and became an instructor in adult basic education. Eleanor was her first student. She learned to read and then helped others as they all progressed toward a GED. She, in fact, stayed longer than she needed to in order to encourage others.

I asked Eleanor why she wanted to get the GED. She said she wanted to leave a legacy for her children and her grandchildren. So now she has her certificate framed, hanging on her wall, and her graduation cap and gown in a case to leave for her children and her grandchildren. She's a VISTA volunteer working in her home community, helping recruit reluctant adults for Laubach.

She is not only an example of how a Federal agency, ACTION, can support literacy organizations, she's an example to those she reaches that it's never too late; and she's an example to the rest of us that literacy can be our most important legacy.

Thank you very much. I'd be glad to entertain any questions.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Haigler.

[Prepared statement of Karl O. Haigler follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KARL O. HAIGLER, DIRECTOR, ADULT LITERACY INITIATIVE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

I appreciate this opportunity to share with you Secretary Bennett's position on the serious national problem of adult illiteracy. In announcing his policy priorities for the next fiscal year, the Secretary made clear his commitment to address the issue by a requested $4.4 million restoring Adult Basic Education Program to its pre-Gramm-Rudman sequestration level. In a time of fiscal stringency, this is in keeping with the Department's focus on helping the educationally disadvantaged, the handicapped and those with limited English proficiency. The Secretary has outlined five "guiding principles" which will direct our approach to this issue. Those principles include:

- prevention that focuses on the proper teaching of reading in our elementary schools
- research that guides policy and informs practice
- shared responsibility of educational achievement between schools, parents and students
- expansion of literacy services through increased participation of the private sector, volunteer groups, and community-based organizations
- and better coordination of programs within and between Federal agencies.

The Secretary's final guiding principle, better program coordination among adult literacy programs, has become a major focus for the office that I direct: the Adult Literacy Initiative. The Initiative was established by the President in 1983 in order to underscore the seriousness of this issue for the nation. One charge of the Initiative is to help build and support a national network of public and private literacy programs. We think that the results of the survey on which we are reporting to you today have significant implications for expanding resources for literacy. The survey was undertaken at the request of the Initiative and in cooperation with the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE). FICE was established by Section 214 of the Department of Education Organization Act, which states that FICE "shall study issues and make recommendations for assuring effective interagency coordination of Federal programs, policies and administrative practices affecting education." Conducted by the Washington Consulting Group, the Federal Literacy Management survey provides us with one tool for accomplishing, in the words of the FICE statute, the "coordination of related programs to assure that the recipients of Federal assistance are efficiently and responsively served."

The contents of this survey can enable literacy and adult education providers to expand services by drawing from a variety of Federal resources. An interagency committee, composed of policy professionals and led by Paul Delker, the Director of Adult Education at the Department, constructed a broad operational definition of literacy programs in keeping with the definition of functional literacy, which is "the attainment of the knowledge and skills, including reading, writing, speaking, listening, computing and problem-solving normally associated with the ability to

function at least at an 8th grade level in adult situations." Adult literacy activities are defined in this report as formal or informal efforts, including portions of broader programs, which aim at the development of functional literacy. These activities include: programs for Basic Skills Training, Life Skills, programs for non-English speaking adults, and programs which address hindrances to literacy, such as learning disabilities or other handicaps. The Executive Summary of the survey has been specifically designed to assist eligible literacy providers in identifying Federal program participants who they can support with their services.

Let me briefly review the key findings of the survey:

- There are 79 programs administered by 14 Federal agencies which directly address literacy concerns, have a significant literacy-related component, or permit State or local recipients to use funds for literacy activities.

- For FY 1985, $347.6 million dollars were obligated for literacy activities. This estimate includes some funds appropriated for programs with broad purposes including, but not specifically limited to, literacy. On the other hand, the authors were not able to obtain estimates of spending on literacy from such major literacy-related programs as the Job Corps and JTPA, so no funds from these programs are included in the total.

- Federal literacy programs address the needs of many different populations and are directed toward a variety of goals. Special programs have been designed for the elderly, Native Americans, refugees, Federal prisoners, high school dropouts, the handicapped, the unemployed, and the limited English proficient. Many programs focus on assisting individuals to gain the skills necessary to obtain employment or to live independently.

- There are significant unreported expenditures on literacy activities in many Federal agencies. In some programs, literacy activities are an integral part of the overall program, but no separate dollar breakout for these activities is available. In many formula grant programs, literacy is an authorized activity, but the State or local entity reports expenditures only by broad categories.

In addition to an Executive Summary, the report contains detailed program descriptions. I would like to call your attention to a few items of interest in the detailed program descriptions.

1. The majority of programs surveyed did not provide information for measuring or evaluating program success.

2. "Secondary programs," i.e. programs in which literacy is an allowable activity and supports the primary objective of the legislation, are typically unable to report a specific percentage of dollars or dollar amounts that go

to literacy. For the Job Training Partnership Act, for instance, we know that some of the $656 million which went to training services for the disadvantaged (Title II-A) included some classroom training. In addition, approximately 30,000 youth received either remedial or basic education services last year in Job Corps Centers.

3. The variety of disadvantaged populations served and the social deficits that are identified underscore the fact that it's difficult to view illiteracy in a vacuum. Rather, the survey helps by portraying the need for literacy in the context of other needs which these programs address.

These observations lead to what should be considered the most important aspects of this survey--how it can be used by Federal departments and agencies in better coordinating literacy efforts and, perhaps more importantly, how information in this report can benefit literacy practitioners and administrators at the State and local level.

First, I can speak directly about the survey's contents as a coordination guide for Federal agencies: it has already contributed to the work of two distinct interagency task forces or working groups with which the Adult Literacy Initiative has been involved:

1. In association with the Labor Department's Education and Training Administration, 5 program offices within the Department--Bilingual Education, Vocational and Adult Education, Special Education, Elementary and Secondary Education, and Postsecondary Education--are discussing a variety of joint projects. These projects would focus on pre-employment activities of

disadvantaged, handicapped, and limited English proficient adults. The Initiative's role is to be a continuing sponsor and monitor of such collaborative efforts.

2. Working with the Departments of Defense, Labor, and Commerce, the Initiative has conducted a series of meetings to discuss field testing the Army's newest basic skills computer software in civilian adult literacy and vocational settings. We are also involving interested private sector representatives, as well as the States, in establishing a more systematic way of disseminating Federally-developed technology for literacy. The significant investment of tax dollars in Defense basic skills programs will continue to be exploited for their possible benefits to the field of adult education.

Much of the information in this report will be useful to literacy providers and adult educators because it identifies Federal programs administered at the State and local level. The Secretary believes that the widest possible variety of organizations should be involved in meeting the needs of adult illiterates. Therefore, in partnership with Cambridge Book Company and diverse literacy and adult education organizations, the Department intends to disseminate this survey as widely as possible. As an example of technology transfer using the most modern means of telecommunications, we will make the report available to all users of LitLine, which the Adult Literacy Initiative jointly sponsors with the Mayor's Commission on Literacy in Philadelphia. LitLine holds the promise of reaching an even broader audience if we can use it to provide useful information, like the results of the FICE survey.

All of the Department's adult literacy efforts are intended to strengthen and develop the State and local networks which are rising to meet the challenge of illiteracy. The Federal role in this effort is crucial; on that there is a clear consensus. The Secretary has indicated his commitment to Departmental leadership on this issue, especially in those areas where it can make the most difference. He will be a spokesman during the ABC/PBS PLUS project and the Department will continue to provide support for PLUS' outreach activities. In the areas of research, NAEP will be releasing this summer an in-depth assessment of the functional literacy skills of young adults, aged 21 to 25. It will be the most in-depth assessment to date of this age group. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement will be conducting competitions for the study of adult literacy in association with the new Reading Center competition and will be sponsoring a conference this summer. The additional $2 million which the Secretary has requested in next year's budget under the Adult Education Act can be used for field research to identify the most effective approaches for teaching adults.

With the coherent strategy the Department has in place--a strategy of improving coordination, fostering the expansion of services through existing programs,and improving literacy practice through making better research available--the Secretary is committed to a strong Federal role in promoting adult literacy. It is a strategy that aims at solutions, identifying nationally significant trends and practices while supporting flexible responses to the problem at the community level.

The role of the States and localities is especially significant, given the discretion provided in the use of Federal funds through State and community grant programs. Program coordination, as envisioned by the FICE survey, is crucial at those levels of government which can fashion the most appropriate responses to the needs of its citizens.

We also know that only as education continues to improve in our elementary and secondary schools--with better reading instruction, higher graduation standards, and lower drop-out rates--will we see a major reduction in functional illiteracy over time. The Secretary has said, and prominent practitioners and scholars agree, that remedial efforts among adults alone will not solve this problem: the schools, with the support of parents and other interested adults, must do their job of "stamping in literacy" during those early years of education if America is to become a more literate society.

Chairman STAFFORD. Now the joint hearing will hear Ms. Keeton.

TESTIMONY OF PATRICIA KEETON, COORDINATOR OF BASIC SKILLS AND FOREIGN-BORN PROGRAMS, HOWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MD

Ms. KEETON. Senator Stafford, Mr. Hawkins, and members of the committee, I am Patricia MacCarthy Keeton. I'm coordinator of basic skills and foreign born programming at Howard Community College. I'm also special project director for an assessment component of Project MAPP, which is the Maryland Adult Performance Program. This program is a combination of an assessment component, an instructional component, and a management component which will improve adult basic education programs in the State.

The assessment program is also an exemplary project of the national diffusion network. Today I represent the Joint Literacy Action Group, and with me is Dr. Richard Long who will be glad to entertain any questions. He is the chairman of the group.

The members of this group include representatives of a wide range of literacy service providers, including professional adult educators and volunteers. The group is also representative of a variety of instructional modes and philosophies, and yet we have come together because, despite the differences in our delivery of the service, we all have a powerful mission that unites us in the desire to assist millions of adults who cannot read at all, or those millions who cannot read well enough to contribute to their community and to their society in general.

Of course, we're all aware of the reasons offered to explain this dilemma in our country. Whether it was that these adults did not receive the proper education as children, or perhaps there are special learning problems, even language barriers. It may also be that their neighbors, their employers or their communities in general lack concern for the difficulties that these people face from day to day, or more likely, there exists a general lack of awareness.

However, this final issue would seem to be the one which will provide the impetus needed to attack the problem. Obviously, in order to begin to address the nationwide problem, we must call upon our Nation and you, as our representatives, to show commitment and support. As Mr. Duffy has so well explained today, project PLUS will forcefully bring an awareness of our need into every living room in this country.

What will be the response? The awareness of the problem and our current level of effort cannot eliminate illiteracy. However, awareness may increase the national will to solve the problem.

What will be the response of Congress? One response, and the one we advocate, is a program that will directly assist literacy programs in the expansion and improvement of their capacity to provide instructional services to adults.

Recent research by the national adult literacy project identifies the characteristics of successful literacy programs. The main finding is that programs with a commitment to integrate and systematically plan, implement and evaluate all components of their proc-

ess, or in other words, those that create a coherent system of adult illiteracy instruction, are the most successful.

On the other hand, the national literacy study also confirms that many literacy programs are overwhelmed to the point that day-to-day operations are all they can hope to accomplish. Designing instructional programs to meet those individual needs of illiterate adults or evaluating the current efforts and training their professional and volunteer staff are well beyond their capacity.

We have a unique opportunity now to capitalize on the expanding interest of the private sector. There are strong indicators that the private sector would increase its involvement if a partnership with a national effort were facilitated. The Congress can develop a collaborative program involving the public and the private sectors.

This program would encourage private contributions to specific literacy programs, and allow for private contributions to a national fund that specializes in literacy programs. This fund, with a significant Federal contribution, would be governed by an independent board. The board would set the criteria for the literacy program applications.

For example, a literacy provider would apply to the fund to add a training component that would increase their professional and volunteer competencies. The provider would obtain a matching grant first, and then apply to the fund.

This proposal is a fairly simple one. The Congress is being asked to create a national fund that would assist literacy programs to develop better services with the help of the private sector. It would not be a substitute for the Adult Education Act.

The Adult Education Act is the backbone of literacy programming in the United States. I'm sure there will be numerous other hearings on the illiteracy problem of adults. As you struggle to find solutions, it could be easy to become overwhelmed by the idea that millions, perhaps tens of millions of Americans, are functionally illiterate.

We, the providers of literacy, are not discouraged. We deal with these adults one by one. They have names and lives, just as we do. They need our help. I hope that you will help respond.

Thank you.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Ms. Keeton, for a very good statement.

[Prepared statement of Patricia Keeton follows:]

Prepared Statement of Patricia M. Keeton, Coordinator of Basic Skills and Foreign Born Programs, Howard County Community College, Howard County, Maryland

Mr. Hawkins and Senator Stafford and members of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education and the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities, I am Patricia Keeton, Coordinator of the Basic Skills and Foreign Born programs at the Howard Community College in Howard County, Maryland. I am also the assessment director of Project MAPP (Maryland Adult Performance Project), for the state department of education in Maryland. Project MAPP is a state-wide effort to improve adult basic education programs by implementing specific instructional, management, and assessment components. I have also worked in education as a teacher of both children and adults for fifteen years. I have taught in a variety of classroom and institutional settings.

Today, I am representing the Joint Literacy Legislation Action Group, which is comprised of:

American Association for Adult and Continuing Education
American Library Association
Association for Community Based Education
B. Dalton Bookseller
International Reading Association
Laubach Literacy International
Literacy Volunteers of America
National Council of La Raza
National Council of State Directors of Adult Education

The membership of these groups include individuals who provide literacy services in traditional and non-traditional programs. Some work on a one-to-one basis and others in group configurations, and there is a wide range of methodology. In short, the membership represents a diversity of services, individuals, and philosophies in the literacy community.

The work of the literacy action group is the result of these joint Congressional hearings. Many of the members of the action group have submitted testimony to the Committees and have individually discussed how to improve the programs that are available to adults who are illiterate. As a result of the testimony this Committee has heard that:

* Illiteracy affects many Americans in many different groups.

* There is disagreement as to the definition of illiteracy and literacy.

* There is disagreement as to how to structure an effective public policy to reduce illiteracy.

Yet the committee has also heard some good news:

* **Businesses** are reaching out to the community to increase public awareness, to improve the efficiency of their workers and the effectiveness of their schools.

* **Community based organizations** are working with the hard to reach illiterates in their communities.

* **Librarians** provide critical training and resources to many illiterate adults.

* **Professional adult educators** are working in small groups and classes in schools, community centers, churches, industrial sites, and community colleges.

* **Volunteers** are working with illiterate individuals in one-to-one and small group settings in homes, churches, community centers, and adult basic education programs.

However, even with this vast diversity of services and options, millions of adults cannot read at all. Millions more cannot read well enough to benefit from or contribute to our society, and the demands of our society for literate individuals are expanding. Campaigns such as Project PLUS, a major national awareness campaign beginning in the Fall, will raise awareness of individuals concerning illiteracy, but it will also highlight the fact that there are not enough programs available to teach all the adults who are seeking services.

There are many reasons for illiteracy and marginal literacy in the United States:

* Poor schooling,
* handicapping conditions,
* language barriers,
* a lack of access to quality services, and
* a lack of community concern for literacy.

Many suggestions have been offered to this Committee. Some would require billions of dollars and others would require billions of hours. However, a cohesive easily implemented national action plan has not resulted from this discussion. The lessons of literacy programs from other countries indicate that the following factors are necessary:

* National support,
* long-term political will,
* community involvement,
* coordination, and the
* development of outreach programs.

These hearings, the Administration's attention, the activities of programs such as Project PLUS, the Coalition for Literacy, BOOK-IT, and others; have increased, and will continue to increase, public awareness of illiteracy in America. However, awareness of the problem and the current alternatives will not solve the dilemma of adult illiteracy, it can only create the national will for the Congress to act.

What is needed, and can be implemented now, is a program to develop the capacity of all the various literacy providers. Capacity development is the ability of a literacy provider to expand and improve their services. One of the significant findings of the National Adult Literacy Project (NALP) funded by the National Institute of Education is that literacy programs are frequently overwhelmed; offering minimal services requires all of their resources. Improving services by developing local materials, designing effective programs for each adult in need, evaluating current services, and/or training for professionals and volunteers, is frequently outside the realm of the program.

Programs and projects can be improved and expanded, but the means must be created. The Federal government needs to enact a program which takes advantage of the wide-ranging private and public services available in the nation. This expansion of services can be managed without any organization fearing the loss of its identity or its flexibility as a volunteer, community-based, or professional provider; the object would be to improve each organization with additional training, improvement of management, and/or access to evaluation programs.

The unique advantage that our proposal capitalizes on now, is the broadening interest of the private sector. The private sector has been and is supporting many literacy programs, services, and projects. However, there are strong indications that the private sector would expand its efforts if it was in partnership with a national effort. The Congress could develop a private/public cooperative program that encourages private contribution to specific state and local literacy programs and allows for private contribution to a national fund specializing in literacy programs. This fund, with a significant Federal contribution, could be governed by an independent board (half the members appointed by the Congress, the other half by the Executive branch). The board could set the requirements for all providers, traditional and non-traditional. They would direct the program to make grants to projects that:

* Develop state literacy resources,

* target programs in areas of high concentrations of illiterate or semi-literate adults,

* impact programs in areas of illiteracy that are hard to reach, and

* evaluate the process and outcomes of the funded projects, and disseminates the findings.

To demonstrate enterpreneural spirit and creativity, the provider would first approach a private or public source of support for a matching grant (not necessarily a one to one match) and then apply to the national fund. Thus, national fund would not have to conduct exhaustive reviews of the proposals, but rather could use the level of local support as an indication of the value of the proposal to reach those who need the services. However, the board would have to also be sensitive to the needs of communities where no matching funds area available and would be required to provide access to funds to create new services in such cases.

This proposal is fairly simple. The Congress is being asked to create a national fund that would assist literacy programs in developing better services by constructing a fund to attract private contributions. It is not a substitute for the **Adult Education Act. The Adult Education Act** is the mainstay of the literacy movement. The Congress needs to expand the funding for that program, as well as to support the identification and dissemination of the results of effective research and practice relating to adult learning.

Millions of Americans are in need of literacy services. Their needs are different, their abilities are different, and the services that meet their needs are different. Ideally, the Congress should legislate a massive multi-year capacity development, research, and service oriented program. However a strong multi-million dollar, multi-year capacity development program would be a good first step.

We are not discouraged, we are challenged.

Thank you.

Chairman STAFFORD. Before we go to questions, the Chair notes that Congressman Gunderson has come into the room. Do you have any statement you wish to make, Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. GUNDERSON. No.

Chairman STAFFORD. All right. Then while we're waiting for Chairman Hawkins and Mr. Martinez to get back here, I will have a few questions to address to the witnesses who have favored us with their advice and presence this morning.

Mr. Duffy, while I was talking about the Burke family, it suddenly occurred to me that one of my neighbors in the little city of Rutland where I grew up and where I still own a home which is my legal residence was a gentleman named Frank Duffy who——

Mr. DUFFY. Frank Duffy, sir.

Chairman STAFFORD. Frank Duffy, who was our Postmaster. His father ahead of him was the national committeeman of the party I don't belong to, but that did not prevent our being neighbors and good friends. I presume you can't claim relationship to that particular Duffy, but he was a very nice man.

Mr. DUFFY. Thank you very much. I have found, since our American Television a new campaign on the air that there are a lot of Duffys in this country, and a lot of them claim they're my relative, and a lot of them want some money. So I'm not sure about this one.

Chairman STAFFORD. Well, I've had a somewhat similar experience, except they realize I haven't any money, so they haven't asked for it.

Mr. DUFFY. Nor do I, sir.

Chairman STAFFORD. Mr. Duffy, how can ABC/PBS venture encourage other such initiatives from the private sector?

Mr. DUFFY. Well, I think that's already happening, Senator Stafford. From the time we began on December 10, the list simply has grown to now there are over 100 organizations from the private sector, volunteer organizations, service organizations, who have joined into Project PLUS, both—and I think this is so important—on the national level, and then going down to the local community level where the problem really is.

I think, again, the most important thing we'll see as this rolls along, and especially after we go on the air in September, this will kind of feed on itself and will keep expanding and expanding, not just in 1 year but, hopefully, for years down the line.

Chairman STAFFORD. I gather from what you've said then that you expect there will be a followup program to the public awareness campaign that you described to us?

Mr. DUFFY. I think there will be a continuing program. What we're doing in the 1986–87 season is putting an enormous concentration on the problem of illiteracy that will bring literally hundreds of millions of impressions of all different kinds, hard news, dramatic story lines, interviews, et cetera. But this will be revisited. Again, I think it will grow as we go through the years.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Haigler, a report released by the Center for Statistics in April 1986 verifies that adult education programs are the backbone of the adult literacy efforts in the Nation. These programs are funded under provisions of the Adult Education Act. So my ques-

tion to you is: In your judgment, how is the Adult Education Act working? What do you see as its strengths and weaknesses in addressing adult illiteracy?

Mr. HAIGLER. Well, I've spent a lot of time reading the Adult Education Act and the regulations that govern the distribution of funds. It's a State managed program and, as you know, gives discretion to the State to come up with a plan to best meet the responses, needs, that is, illiteracy needs of their particular populations. I think that's all for the good.

I think—and that's a strength, and it is the backbone, the Adult Basic Education Program is a backbone for delivery of services when one looks at illiteracy in isolation. It does things such as basic literacy, zero to fourth grade reading level. It has GED, as I mentioned in my comments earlier, English as a second language. And from State to State the needs vary. We know that from our ILP study. The needs for illiteracy in various States vary significantly. The need in California is different from the need in Kentucky. We can tell that from our breakdown of illiteracy problems throughout the States.

I would say, however, that the expansion of services—that term in the Adult Education Act must include in the expansion of services, as inatended by Congress, a diversity of literacy organizations to meet this need. That includes volunteer programs. That includes for profit programs, as stated in the act. That includes community based organizations.

If you look at the State plan and the people who are supposed to be involved in developing that plan, it seems to me it's a tremendous opportunity and a tremendous tool to promote the kind of coordination on the State and local level that I think would be the most vital ingredient for the kind of coordination that we need to be doing at the Federal level.

So I think the way it's structured and what's intended in the act is absolutely supportive of what the President's intent has been all along with the initiative, and that is helping bring in more groups to provide literacy services as a way of expanding services for the illiterate adult.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you. Ms. Keeton, what do you think of the Department of Education's census data survey results?

Ms. KEETON. Well, sir, I did read the test. I have testified to the fact that I have worked in the assessment component for the last 2 years. My reaction would be taken from the statements of the people who originally put the test together, and that it was never designed to be a measure of literacy. It was designed to assist those people questioning recipients of welfare, and whether or not those folks could understand the bureaucratese in the forms.

So given that information and my own personal view of the test, it would seem that it was not designed to do what it reportedly did.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you very much. Thank you all.

I'm going to turn now to my cochairman, Chairman Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Senator Stafford. May I make an observation, because I think that I would like to commend all of the witnesses for their ideas. I'm sorry, Ms. Keeton, we didn't hear yours. I think the public awareness idea that ABC is doing is excellent. However, I'm concerned about what goes beyond that public

awareness when the public is made thoroughly aware of what the problem is, the magnitude of the problem. They become aroused; they want to do something.

They will turn to agencies and services that are mentioned and will be turned away, as they already are. If we arouse individuals to do something about their problem and they find themselves in a position of being denied an opportunity to do something, you lead to frustration. That's what I'm greatly concerned about now.

Despite the fact that, as Mr. Haigler has said about the Adult Education Act being really the backbone of literacy programs for adults, that program has been cut by thirty percent since 1981. Education programs in general have been cut back by over 22 percent. So that when we begin to make people aware of what the problem is and then say to them that, sure, preschool education is great; every child should be in preschool education, some of the States are moving to do so. And yet we have reduced that program drastically, up to the point only 18 percent of the young kids 3 and 4 years old are now able to take advantage of it. Will this public awareness get to the core of the problem? Will there be any method whereby we will reverse this trend?

We are actually creating illiterates at the same time that we're talking about the magnitude of the problem, and we're doing very little about it. We haven't had a education initiative since the mid-1960's, nothing to brag about. And we're whittling away at those that we have evaluated to be good. We're cutting back on them, because of the obsession about a balanced budget. Now how are we going to get beneath this and actually have something tangible to do something about the problem? And I'm not criticizing what any of you have suggested. I think it's good, and it isn't a criticism of what you will be doing. But somewhere, someplace, we are not doing the job, and we're falling behind as a nation.

The Commission on Excellence in Education, a very fine commission just rendered 2 years ago under this administration, I think, indicated we are a nation at risk. And yet, being a nation at risk we are not doing the things that will remove the causes of this problem.

It just seems to me to have the public awareness, although that is excellent as a first step, we're not willing to take the second or the third step in order to do something about it. Are we going to continue to cut back on Adult Education Act, as we are going to do probably this year, at the same time that we're talking about the problem? Are we going to get beneath the public awareness issue and do something to incrementally at least expand those programs that are successful, that have proved to be successful, to actually reach the problem of young people who can't read and who are denied that opportunity. Then, as Governor Baliles said, we're going to—when they get to prison, then we're going to try, because we have a captive audience, say that if you can't read your release will be jeopardized. It seems to me that's excellent, but it's not enough.

I just question whether or not we're going to end up in 1986 in the same stew that we've been in, and nobody is going to do very much about it. I don't know who should respond to that problem, because it isn't just—I'm not blaming you, but somebody is going to

have to do something more than what we are now planning to do, and this committee has tried to grapple with that problem, and no one is willing to say, look what you're doing. Your budget cuts are wrong, and they're not balancing the budget, and we should do something about that.

Business executives, I think, are beginning to make—have some awareness of it, and I think they have indicated support for these programs. And yet we can't somehow get support in the Congress.

Mr. DUFFY. Congressman Hawkins, may I just speak to the first part of your question with an observation. I can't speak to the budget cuts and the Congress and so forth. But as far as the awareness raising phase is concerned, that's why I stated in my remarks that it is preceded by the outreach program. The fact is that there is a 10 month campaign across the country. There are now 200 task forces being put into place by the private sector that can take these learners when the awareness raising phrase comes, so that they will have a place to go.

Now we're very, very sensitive to the fact—and the question has been asked, and quite rightly so—will this enormous awareness bring too many learners, so that they won't have a place to go? Will they be put back in the shadows, so to speak? We're very sensitive to that.

What we're trying to do is, even if in communities there is not a place to go, but there will be a place to go, that a credo, some guidelines be drawn so that those people in that community, those task forces or that task force can respond properly to the learner; because it's going to be tough enough to get them out anyway, because they're embarrassed or humiliated and so forth.

Incidentally, in our programming we're sensitive to that, too, on how it's portrayed. But I believe—I sincerely believe that with this all-out effort that does include public educators as part of this overall campaign, this will, as I said before, feed on itself so something will be done. And as we feel progress, as learners come out and start to learn and read and write and comprehend and enjoy their lives, more and more will happen.

We have been asked, why didn't you wait then until the outreach program, until you resecure, until you're 1,000 percent? Well, we could do that; but we'd never get to that goal line, in my opinion. By stating that we will start with this awareness raising phase in September, we've seen an enormous response from Government, from Governors, from mayors, from the private sector, from the business coalition for effective literacy, as a matter of fact, that really now is gratifying to us. Maybe not the end result, but as we said many times, let us begin, because it's a very, very positive step.

Chairman HAWKINS. Let me just simply suggest one thing, Mr. Duffy.

Mr. DUFFY. Yes, sir.

Chairman HAWKINS. To you and, obviously, I'm not on the payroll of the ABC or anyone in that capacity shouldn't be telling you what to do, because you're doing a pretty good job doing what you're doing, but the impression is given that some children can't learn and that we're not going to spend any money on those children. I hope that this public awareness will include some good

models around the country where the people have the determination to do something about illiteracy and stop it at the very beginning so that we don't become adults not being able to read.

We have a good program in Prince Georges County where 3 years ago their schools were behind the national standards, 60 percent are black and Hispanics and so forth. They have been able to demonstrate that they can turn that situation around. I can tell you the same thing about Jackson, MS, about some cities in Michigan, St. Louis, MO, and other places where schools are succeeding in addressing the problem of minorities segregated—yes, segregated and with the denial of resources and, in spite of the cutbacks are teaching children how to read, and they're doing a good job of it.

Now this idea that you don't throw money at the problem. Well, that's true, but it does take a little money. It doesn't take a great deal of it. It takes a lot of dedication and some money. You can't just continue to cut budgets and think that that's going to produce literates. It just isn't going to do it. You need some encouragement at the local districts and some—even my own State of California. We have a constitutional limit. We can't increase—the State can't increase anymore its funding for the schools, but it's suffering from a decrease in Federal funds for these special groups such as the limited English speaking groups, those from family backgrounds that don't have readers in the home, and so forth. These are the fine things that Bennett says should be done, but they're suffering these cutbacks.

I would like to see at least some attempt made to show that success can be done, and that we can teach every child to read. If we start soon enough, we can do it—and show some of these success stories on how they have done it. That way, maybe embarrass some of the other districts. Even my own district, Valley Unified School District, is doing a lousy job. I'd like to see them embarrassed by saying, well, look, if the kids in Jackson, MS can do it, if they can do it in Prince George's County, if they can do it in St. Louis, the same type of kids, why is it that you aren't doing the job, too? And I hope that maybe some way I can subversively get some of my participation in some of your programs in that way by you doing it.

Mr. DUFFY. Well, I think what you've said is very important, and there's no question about the fact that we have to approach it from various angles, and through interviews, through story lines, dramatic story lines that have an impact, or through observations on a sports program, show that even though it seems impossible, they can learn. And we intend to use learners, those people who have been unable to read or write and who now, over a period of time, have learned to read and write, comprehend and so forth, will be on public service announcements. But that isn't just at the national level.

I think, most importantly, what you said there is in individual communities through the individual stations, that that be pointed out that here in this community, in Los Angeles or whatever it is, this has happened, and it can happen.

Everybody seems to think that this problem is someplace else except in our own hometown and, as you know, it's not. It's in every hometown.

Chairman HAWKINS. Thank you. Thank you, Senator.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you, Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me make one quick observation and ask two questions. First of all, I'm sorry that I'm late. We are having a little problem getting a budget resolution on the President's desk that was due April 15th. We're in budget conference. We were doing well until this week. Now we seem to be going backward.

Chairman STAFFORD. I was going to say, what else is new?

Mr. GOODLING. Of course, I think, and have said this for many years, that functional illiteracy is the most serious problem we have in the country. At one time, many illiterate people could get jobs and keep jobs and take care of their families, but that time is gone forever. Now the job demands are so great that, as a matter of fact, employers, can't worry about are they literate or not, but they have to worry about, how do they retrain for the next job?

My hope is to be here long enough to see government on all levels and the private sector develop what I call a four-story house. I think that the only way you can do very much about this situation is to attack it from all levels in the family or, otherwise, it just repeats and repeats and repeats.

My home would have the parents on the first floor in the evening learning to be literate, and on the second floor would be the early childhood youngsters, and on the third floor of the house would be the kindergarten, first and second graders. Then on the fourth floor would be the older children under real supervision in relationship to the work that they are trying to accomplish in school.

The chairman and I started to build this house yesterday with the help of the committee. Again, it wasn't anything big, but it was an awareness kind of thing that the chairman was talking about. My part of the bill was the Even Start Act which is trying to deal with the illiteracy question and, above all, deal with the question in such a way that you are dealing with the children and the parents at the same time.

So while you're helping the parents to become literate, you are also helping the parents to develop some skills that will help them do the preschool reading readiness kind of things that many other families do so that the child will have an even start once they get to first grade.

Having said that, I would ask two questions, Mr. Haigler. First of all, in your survey, did you find any programs that combined early childhood education with adult education, children with their parents, to address illiteracy?

Mr. HAIGLER. Congressman Goodling, the survey per sey did not identify. However, we know under chapter 1 that there is eligible—the funds are eligible currently to be used for those kinds of activities.

I also know from talking to people in the field in your home State of Pennsylvania, this is actually being done by the demonstration site for Penn State University. It's also being done in Arkansas in chapter 1 funds.

We know in Kentucky they're doing our program—Sharon Darling, I believe, testified in front of your committee to the fact that

they are doing an Even Start activity funded by the State of Kentucky, $1.2 million over the next 2 years.

So the concept is a sound one. My—To let you know in the context of our survey which tries to identify programs that are already in place, that are eligible for adult literacy activities to take place, not necessarily mandating them but making them eligible for that kind of support. Chapter 1 is certainly one of those, and people throughout the country are becoming more aware of that, and we're going to make them more aware of it, working with our chapter 1 director as well as with the distribution of this survey.

We think it's going to alert a number of people to the resources that are available in Federal programs already.

I would like, if I could, comment in that context on other programs within the Department that don't necessarily have adult literacy, adult education next to them, but the same concept applies. For instance, the Secretary has asked for $75 million to go into a teacher effectiveness fund, as you know, for secondary and elementary teachers.

There is no reason that money in the secondary component, particularly, couldn't go for teacher training institutes for adult educators, particularly for the GED. Also, there are other programs such as citizenship or—excuse me, legal education, a $2 million program. There is no reason that money could not be used to teach adults in the context of teaching them about legal documents that they might have to sign or legal concepts that they may need to be aware of.

There is no cutback, by the way, in the adult education budget. I just want to say that. There's no cutback in chapter 1. There's no cutback in—that is in the budget request for fiscal year 1987 in special education or in bilingual education.

One comment also about the——

Chairman HAWKINS. Would the gentleman yield? You say there's no cutback in adult education. It has been at $100 million, has it not, since 1981?

Mr. HAIGLER. Yes, sir. It started out——

Chairman HAWKINS. So it has not been adjusted. In constant dollars—What are we—Those are the dollars we spend, isn't it true? If there's been a depreciation due to inflation——

Mr. HAIGLER. I didn't understand that qualification.

Chairman HAWKINS. You say there's no cutback, but you—we're talking about constant dollars. In terms of constant dollars, is it not true that the amount has been reduced?

Mr. GOODLING. Those are constant ones that you spend. I have to borrow mine in order to spend it.

Mr. HAIGLER. I didn't understand your qualification there.

Chairman HAWKINS. When you say there has not been a cutback in funds for a program, I am simply saying is that true if you're talking about constant dollars, the same type of dollars that the Pentagon spends?

Mr. HAIGLER. Well, the request—I haven't done those kind of calculations, but I didn't understand that to be your point in terms of——

Chairman HAWKINS. Well, I just want to call attention to the fact that your statement said there has not been any cutbacks

would seem to be in direct contrast to the statement that I made. I was talking about constant dollars, and you are talking about dollars as of 1981.

Mr. HAIGLER. Well, it seems to me, it's fair to say that inflation under this administration has declined significantly. So we have a lot more constant dollars to talk about than we did previously. But I understand your point now, sir. I just wanted to make sure that—In absolute dollars, as we would say, as the public would view those figures, there hasn't been a cutback proposed in adult education by Secretary Bennett for fiscal year 1987. I just wanted to make that point for the record.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Duffy, I would ask you, since surveys that we see show that youngsters watch 4 to 5 hours of television a day, and I imagine many more in many other households, do you have any plans to place educational programming such as Sesame Street and so on, on TV during prime child viewing times?

Mr. DUFFY. No. We don't, as of this moment, Congressman Goodling. What we have found in national television is that the best way to reach children—and we got pretty deeply involved in this in the early seventies—is not through long form educational programming in prime time, but in shorter vignettes with pro social values, as we do on Saturday morning with Scholastic Rock and History Rock and Science Rock and science tips and so forth, and put those pro social values into entertainment programming so that the awareness level and attitudes come out of that rather than long form programming that, our experience has been, they simply won't watch in any considerable numbers.

Consequently, we have been working on that for a long time and think we've made some progress.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you, Congressman Goodling.

Congressman Martinez.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Thank you, Senator Stafford, Mr. Chairman. I want to get back to one point that our chairman, Mr. Hawkins, was trying to make. And let me not ask the question, but make the statement; because it's an absolutely true statement.

Where the budget has been constant and there's been no cut, the dollar today from what it was in 1981 buys only two-thirds of the service it did then. So the budget has really been cut by one-third, because it's not kept abreast of the cost-of-living increases. So we actually have one less third.

To say simply that we haven't made a cut, or we're not making a cut, or there's been no cut is belying the fact that you have made a cut, because you haven't kept abreast of what it takes to buy that service. And that's a fact.

Going back to the study that you've referred to several times here, Mr. Haigler, that recently released survey by the Census Bureau that was initiated by the Department of Education indicates that 13 percent of all the adults in the United States are illiterate. But what's more amazing about that is that, of that rate, 50 percent almost—48 percent—are people whose language was not English. And therein lies a big problem, and that's one of the reasons why I've introduced the English Proficiency Act of 1986, asking for the moneys that I think that Ms. Keeton referred to

that we need; because unless—and I know the other side of the aisle says you can't throw money at the problem, but this is a problem that needs money. You're going to need the money to do the job. All the media attention that you give it—and the public awareness that you get—is very important to help those of us in Congress who feel that we need to have money to do this job. I think this is going to raise the public consciousness to support it.

I was, you know, touring around the country on—holding subcommittee hearings, Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities; and it was referred to that the JPTA money—part of that was used for English proficiency. How that comes about—and I don't know how you can actually measure how much of it is done, because I'm sure that there are a lot of programs, training programs, going on that do the same thing that they do in San Jose.

When these people come in to get trained, because as Mr. Goodling has outlined, the technology is changing, the job descriptions are changing, job needs, training needs are changing, it's not like the old days when you could go out and get a job in a steel mill and they could teach you what you needed to know right there. Now you have to have some knowledge, technical knowledge, to get into some of these other jobs, especially in the Silicon Valley and San Jose.

What the San Jose Training Center has done, in realizing when these people came in they had language barrier problems and they had definitely English proficiency problems, they developed what's called a feeder class. In a relatively short time they take these people and they give them the remedial skills they need to understand to read and write English and read and write the forms that they need to fill out and the forms that they need to do to make reports on the kind of a job they're going to have now. Then they absorb to a much greater extent the training that they receive, which is a plus.

I think too much is done about studying and deciding how we're going to do, and I want to commend Ms. Keeton and her group; because they have the plan of action that we should adopt. After you make the American people aware of what the problem is and that there is a severe problem and a very serious one, then we need to take action of doing what needs to be done. And that's just simply teaching them. Teaching them is the simple solution to the problem.

Now I just heard in the hallway one of my colleagues say that—and, surprisingly, from a colleague that I would have never expected it—that, hey, those that are going to learn are going to learn in the system we have, and those that don't want to learn aren't going to learn. That's not the problem at all.

The problem is, like I related, 48 percent of them having language barrier problems—I have one, too—language barrier problems that have to be corrected at an early age, and they're not. That's why I support Mr. Goodling's legislation called Even Start, because we get to doing something about the problem early.

Understand that a lot of these bilingual children never had a good sense of grammar, which is the basis of language learning, in the language that they spoke, sometimes in Spanish and sometimes in the Asian languages. Understand that a lot of the criticism of

bilingual education is aimed at the Hispanics because everybody seems to see that it's only for Hispanics, but that's not true either.

In fact, the one case in California that brought about the need for bilingual education was not brought about by Hispanics but brought about by a Chinese gentleman. So that is, you know, a very misunderstood situation in the United States.

I think that in reading your testimony and listening to your testimony, Mr. Duffy, several questions arose in my mind. One is: When you talk about the coordinators, what are those coordinators going to do exactly? Are they going to direct these people that call in to the programs that are really going to provide that service, that service that I talk about which is essentially teaching them?

Mr. DUFFY. I'm going to ask Dr. Harr to respond to that.

Mr. HARR. The illiteracy coordinators at the ABC and PBS stations—their job is to try to work with community resources to bring a task force into existence, a communitywide task force or coalition that may represent all elements in the community, business, labor, the churches, city hall, the media. So their role is one of initiative to try to get that process started, and in the course of doing that perhaps to expand training opportunities where churches, employee associations, business firms, might begin to make space available and do more by way of volunteer programs.

So that's their role. This is kind of an initiative and convening role. Then, of course, as the awareness raising begins, to work in their local station with local programming that will be tailored to that community. So they're not literacy service providers, if that's your question.

Mr. MARTINEZ. But they're going to try to find the people that are literacy providers?

Mr. HARR. Try to generate community action, because that's where the problem has to be dealt with. That's where people live and work and can have access to training, if we can provide those opportunities. So they'll try to generate activity rather than try to pose as literacy providers themselves, because they're not. They're television people.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I think the important part of public awareness is that when the public becomes aware and they look someplace for the service, that there is somebody there to tell them—direct them where they need to go for that service.

One of the things about almost anything the government does is outreach. So many people don't know what's available or what the government does provide, or what's available to them to overcome a problem they have.

Mr. Duffy, you alluded in your testimony, too, to the fact that certain kinds of programming, you're going to have interviews of people that are going to talk of the problem of raising awareness. Has anything been done in regards to having actual lesson programming? We know that one of the great vehicles in some education systems is the television in classrooms where tapes and cassettes of a particular subject matter are played, and the students seem to learn even to a greater extent from that. Is anything like that going to be done?

Mr. DUFFY. Yes. Across the country in many—I was going to say several, but many communities, they are planning to do that in

their respective communities. They can do that best where they can facilitate where the people can be and have a group or one-on-one along with the on-the-air programming.

As far as national programming is concerned, we don't feel that—at least at this juncture, that that really is effective and can work that well.

I want to make a comment, if I may, on your other question which is a good one. One of the unique qualities we have here with the national television system is we can convene, even on a closed circuit, to bring those working forces in various communities into studios across the country to link it to what the national program is and give "how to do's."

We just did that, as a matter of fact. We just did—PBS just did June 2, and then we will have another closed circuit to all of our stations across the country in the middle part of July, and they will ask these work forces that are now expanding to come in. I think this makes our program different than anything that's been done before.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I'm looking forward to it, and I think it is great; because I think that not many or not enough people have really been aware of the problem that we have. It's been like they swept it under the rug. They don't want to face it. They want to find other reasons that these people aren't able to take advantage of the opportunities that exist or even present themselves for those opportunities. So I think it's very important.

Mr. HARR. Just one other comment, Congressman Martinez, on the question of TV instruction in the classroom. It can be a useful tool, and it can supplement. One of our stations, our affiliated station in Detroit, for example, is going to produce 30 half-hours of a reading course that will be presented over the air in the Detroit area, which is really kind of a first for a commercial television station. But they know that they're not going to teach people to read in 6 weeks, you know, 5 days a week for 30 days, but they do hope to overcome the inhibition and the barrier and to begin to prepare people so they can then follow up and get into a course. The purpose really is to stimulate that.

Also, public television will be presenting 43 half-hours of a GED course which, I think, can be very useful. But that also probably will work best in conjunction with tutors or learning centers.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I'm really glad you said that, Mr. Harr, and I'll tell you why, because people don't realize, too, that many times people don't come forward for the instruction that is available because they feel from the point they're starting, they're embarrassed to go forward.

When I was walking precincts in my district, I found a lot of people like that, that didn't speak English well and were embarrassed to go to the adult education classes and take the subject, because everybody would make fun of them. That's an embarrassment—a real embarrassment that people live with. Maybe the more aggressive and the more eager people will overcome that and do it, but there's a lot of people that need somebody to push them that first little nudge that will get them to doing it. I think that you're right.

Regarding the Adult Education Act, in that act does it mandate that adult education courses teach English proficiency in the different school districts, local school districts? Don't the local school districts have the option to determine what classes are taught in the adult education system?

Mr. HAIGLER. Well, they have that option, and it would be in—it's not mandated, because the plan would be responsive to whatever the needs are in that community; but we do know that ESL, English as a second language, probably ranks third only to basic literacy and GED in terms of programs across the country that do literacy. ESL is typically third, and in sections such as the southwest, California, New York, Florida, other States, they would be more responsive in terms of ESL because of the greater need.

We know, for instance, my trip to California in October, I was told that 80 percent of the programs there, public and private, do English as a second language. Of course, that's not only dealing with Hispanics, as you mentioned, because of the varied nature of the ESL problem. You have classes in adult education and in local volunteer programs that teach as many as 12 to 15—people with 12 to 15 different languages. So English as a second language is a very large component, of course, in those States and those communities, where there is that kind of need.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Has the Department of Education bothered to try to find out how much of the need is being serviced?

Mr. HAIGLER. Well, that's difficult to do, because the difference is, it would have to do with those people being served and those people who need the service. And that's hard to do, other than try to do it in a national sample.

What we find locally is that people might have a better idea than that, but as you know, in an area that is—when you call it a hidden problem and then try to find out numbers about a hidden problem, it is going to be a rather elusive figure to get hold of.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Let me put it another way. Then if you knew simply that there were waiting lists in those kinds of classes in local schools in the adult education system, wouldn't you say that there was a shortage of money to provide the services?

Mr. HAIGLER. That would be one inference you could draw. Another inference you might draw is that there needs to be a better referral system. In other words, if there's a waiting list in one program, there might—and I heard about this, as a matter of fact, in my visit to California——

Mr. MARTINEZ. That's why I bring it up.

Mr. HAIGLER. Excuse me?

Mr. MARTINEZ. This is why I bring it up, because it's apparent in my district that community-based organizations are now doing it on a volunteer basis because these people can't get into the adult education system in the schools that are providing that.

Mr. HAIGLER. What I'm saying is—and I think what the PLUS project is doing is a very good example of what needs to happen in all communities, is where literacy providers get together, and when there is a problem of a waiting list and say, in an ABE or other programs, there needs to be a referral system where people are targeted for the program that best addresses their needs.

So if you have a waiting list in one program and there's another program that's got a recruitment problem, that tells you you got a problem which is referral, which is lack of coordination.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Well, let me simply say that in my district it's a fact that there is not enough—there are not enough facilities there to provide the need, and there are people that are waiting. There are community-based organizations. You referred to the need of using community-based organizations. I think you're absolutely right, because they don't have the rigid structure that a school system has, and they can be more flexible with their hours and everything else and provide a better service. And they're doing it from a real genuine concern of what happens in that community. So I think that's an important component, and my bill addresses that, that 50 percent of the monies that we're asking to be allocated for this English proficiency program is directed toward community-based organizations.

Thank you, Mr. Stafford.

Chairman STAFFORD. Thank you very much, Congressman. For the joint two committees that have held this hearing, we want to again express our appreciation to all of the witnesses who have come and helped us address the problem of illiteracy this morning.

So with that, we'll say the joint committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:54 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Material submitted for inclusion follows:]

[From the New York Times, Apr. 12, 1986]

THIRTEEN PERCENT OF U.S. ADULTS ARE ILLITERATE IN ENGLISH, A FEDERAL STUDY FINDS

(By Leslie Maitland Werner)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—Thirteen percent of the adults living in the United States are illiterate in English, a study by the Census Bureau has found.

According to the study's supervisor, the illiteracy rate for adult Americans whose native language is English was 9 percent. For adults whose native language is not English, the illiteracy rate climbed to 48 percent. A large portion of those people are, by their own account, probably literate in their native language, according to the study.

The literacy test, given by the Census Bureau to 3,400 adults in the United States in 1982, was the first of its kind conducted by the Government, according to Robert E. Barnes, acting director of the Education Department's planning and technical analysis division, who supervised the project. Mr. Barnes said the survey, which was conducted in the homes of those tested, had a margin of sampling error of one to two percentage points.

PREVIOUS ESTIMATE MUCH SMALLER

Of the native English-speakers who failed the test, 70 percent had not finished high school, and 42 percent had earned no money in the year before they were tested.

Mr. Barnes said that the test results provide a much more accurate portrayal of the nation's illiteracy problem than did the Census Bureau's previous estimate, in 1979, theat only one-half of one percent of Americans over the age of 14 were illiterate.

"Many estimates of illiteracy have relied on impressionistic evidence or inferences from a single variable such as years of school completed," Mr. Barnes said. The tiny figure that the Census Bureau reported in 1979, for instance, reflected its definition of literate people as those who said they have obtained a fifth-grade education.

The new study shows that for adults 20 to 40 years old whose native language is English, the illiteracy problem was 10 times greater than it would have appeared if literacy had been defined as meaning five years of schooling, Mr. Barnes said.

ABILITY TO PERFORM TASKS

A number of other studies, however, have painted an even grimmer picture than that presented by the survey. The most widely accepted study, published by the University of Texas in 1975, examined adult performance levels in terms of "functional competency," including skills in communication, computation, problem-solving and interpersonal relations.

That study, the Adult Performance Level Project, found that almost 20 percent of American adults were unable to perform everyday adult tasks. Another 34 percent could perform the tasks, but not proficiently, the study found.

In judging adult performance, that test evaluated such skills as the ability to read a help-wanted ad in a newspaper, or write a grocery list.

By contrast, a new study, the English Language Proficiency Survey, was drawn more narrowly. "One could easily make a case for a higher standard of literacy" than the one the new test employed, Mr. Barnes said.

"When I look at the test, I almost think I could pass it if it were given in Egyptian hieroglyphics," Mr. Barnes said. "I wanted a conservative estimate. I didn't want to be accused of setting too high a standard."

"I could imagine giving people a three-page text and asking them to write a one paragraph summary and having a reult of 85 percent adult illiteracy, including college graduates," Mr. Barnes said. "So I don't think we found the right number. I think we found a floor."

MULTIPLE CHOICE TEST

The Census Bureau test was of the multiple-choice variety. The reading portion called for choosing the best of four possible meanings for a specific word or phrase in a sentence.

One problem read, "The patient has the right to ask for information about his sickness." For "sickness," the test offered four potential synonyms: "benefits, business, expenses, illness."

Another section of the test required selecting the best word or words to complete a sentence. For instance, "Don't allow your medical identification card to ——— by any other person." The choices for the missing phase were: "be used, have destroy, go lose, get expired."

The test "was a 'read-and-recognize' test," Mr. Barnes said. "It was not a 'read-and-perform' or even a 'read-and-write' test."

A score of 20 correct answers on the 26-question test was considered an indication of literacy. Simply increasing that requirement by one, Mr. Barnes said, would have increased the total estimate of illiterate adults considerably.

LITERACY STANDARD QUESTIONED

However, Jeanne S. Chall, an education professor who is director of the reading laboratory at Harvard University, challenged the validity of choosing 20 correct answers as an arbitary standard of literacy.

"You have to be careful saying that if you get 20 right you are or are not literate," Dr. Chall said. "Twenty correct should be equatable with a specific reading level or explainable in terms of real things they may read, such as specific newspapers or magazines."

Dr. Chall also said that the overall illiteracy figure produced by the survey "makes sense" as an estimate. But she said getting the exact number of illiterate people was far less important than just recognizing the existence of the problem.

"What does it matter if there are 10 million or 20 million complete illiterates?" she said. "We're not even taking care of a small fraction of them. It would be nice to know how many there are, but it doesn't matter. There are just too many."

The test administered by the Census Bureau was originally designed in the late 1970's by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to determine whether adults, expecially those with a non-English speaking background, were equipped to deal with official notices and applications for assistance.

IN LIVING ROOMS AND KITCHENS

The Education Department decided to administer the test in 1982. At that time, at the direction of Congress, it was about to have the Census Bureau conduct a survey aimed at determining how many children required bilingual education. The literacy questions were put to adults at the same time the children were tested.

At "kitchen tables, dining tables, coffee tables and in living rooms," Mr. Barnes said, 3,400 adults took the literacy tests as 4,000 school-age children with non-Eng-

lish-speaking back-grounds and 4,800 childern in native-English-speaking homes took the bilingual education test.

Mr. Barnes said that 4,200 adults had been asked to take it, but that 800 had declined.

The sample tested was selected following procedures developed by the statistical methods division of the Census Bureau, Mr. Barnes said. It drew on information from the 1980 Census and supplementary listings of new households. It did not include hospital patients or prison inmates.

Mr. Barnes said the Census Bureau gave the department the raw test data in early 1984 and that the department did its first tabulations last November. And while Secretary of Education William J. Bennett has mentioned the study's total illiteracy figure in recent testimony in House hearings, the department has not yet disseminated the findings of its survey.

STATISTICAL VIEW OF ILLITERACY

The test results provide a new and detained picture of the population of illiterates. About 37 percent of them speak a language other than English at home; among that group, 82 percent are immigrants and 21 percent entered the United States in the last six years. About 14 percent of those who speak a language other than English at home were probably literate in their own language, based on their reported education, the study found.

"Education is still the prime indicator of literacy rates," Mr. Barnes said, adding that 60 percent of all native English-speakers who had completed high school answered all 26 questions on the test correctly.

About 0.8 percent of those with some college education failed the test; 6 percent of those who finished high school failed; 18.6 percent of those with some high school failed; 34.3 percent of those with six to eight years of schooling failed, and 53.3 percent of those with five or less years of schooling failed.

The test identified various factors as potential risks contributing to the likelihood of illiteracy. These risks included education, immigration status, use of a non-English language, race, age and poverty.

13% of Adults in U.S. Failed This Test

Sample questions given by the Census Bureau to 3,400 adults in 1982.

Directions: Choose the answer that means the same as the word or phrase with a line under it.

We cannot see you today. When can you return?

a. When was the last time you came?
b. Who should you call when you come?
c. On what date can you come again?
d. Are those the papers you can return?

Enter your Social Security number here.

a. Find
b. Check
c. Show
d. Write

Directions: Choose the best answer to the question.

You should ask a friend or relative to help you fill out the forms if you cannot read or understand the application.

What should you do if you do not understand the questions on the application form?

a. Answer all the questions by writing "None."
b. Return the application unsigned.
c. Write to the notary public.
d. Ask a friend or relative to help you.

Directions: Read all of the paragraph first. Draw a line under the best word or phrase to complete each sentence.

Soon, you'll receive a new medical services program identification card. It will replace all other medical _____. Before using the card you

a. bills
b. cards
c. types
d. checks

must sign _____ on the back. Don't allow your

a. the
b. it
c. on
d. a

medical identification card to _____ by

a. be used
b. have destroy
c. go lose
d. get expired

any other person.

Source: Census Bureau